DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 820 CG 025 090

AUTHOR Figueira-McDonough, Josefina
TITLE Correlates of Delinquency and Teenage Motherhood.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 92
CONTRACT SES-92-13412
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (42nd, Pittsburgh, PA, August 18-20, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Delinquency; *Early Parenthood; Females; *Mothers; *Pregnancy; *Socioeconomic Status

ABSTRACT

High rates of delinquency and of teenage motherhood in a community have been found to be associated with conditions that characterize the underclass. Furthermore, the concentration of these youth behaviors in such communities are assumed to play an important role in the reproduction of the underclass. Using census, health, and juvenile court data of a large western city, this study compared zip code areas according to a typology of different levels of delinquency and teenage motherhood. The results of contrast and discriminant analyses indicated that worse-off communities were characterized by higher rates of teenage motherhood than were better-off communities. The relationship between area characteristics and delinquency was found to be more complex. In worse-off communities, high delinquency occurred in areas with the greatest levels of deprivation and segregation. In better-off communities, in contrast, high population mobility was associated with delinquency. The presence of higher income and employment rates and of low dropout rates and low minority representation predicted groups with low teenage pregnancy. High delinquency among these groups was a function of mobility. Low income, high unemployment, high dropout rates, and a large representation of minorities in a given area favored a context where high delinquency and high teenage motherhood rates emerged. (Author/NB)

CORRELATES OF DELINQUENCY AND TEENAGE MOTHERHOOD*

Josefina Figueira-McDonough
Arizona State University

SSSP, 1992

*The research reported in this paper has been funded by a NSF Grant (SES-92-13412).

ABSTRACT

High rates of delinquency and of teenage motherhood in a community have been found to be associated with conditions that characterize the underclass. Furthermore, the concentration of these youth behaviors in such communities are assumed to play an important role in the reproduction of the underclass. Using census, health and juvenile court data of a large western city, this study compares zip code areas according to a typology of different levels of delinquency and teenage motherhood. The results of contrast and discriminant analysis indicate that worse-off communities are characterized by higher rates of teenage motherhood than better-off communities. The relationship between area characteristics and delinquency is more complex. In worse-off communities, high delinquency occurs in areas with the greatest level of deprivation and segregation. In better-off communities, high population mobility is associated with delinquency.

COMMUNITIES AND RATES OF YOUTH DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Recently, Jencks (1991) has argued that there is no evidence for the youth deterioration hypothesis that is linked to the concept of reproduction of the underclass. He uses national statistics to show that, in the last five decades, there has actually been an improvement in educational performance and a stabilization in delinquency rates, as well as some reduction in teenage motherhood rates (Butler, 1992). On the other hand, Wilson argues that although national and even citywide statistics might support an optimistic view of youth performance, analysis of the geographical distribution of such behaviors tells a different story. Of special concern are the alarming figures in urban communities that fit the profile of underclass: high unemployment rates, high percentages of households receiving welfare, high proportions of single-headed households, high transiency, low supervision of children (Ellwood, 1988, pp. 193-200), and physical deterioration (Skogan, 1990). According to Wilson, what distinguishes the underclass is that communities isolated by a tradition of minority segregation and with a long-term concentration of widespread economic marginalization form a milieu that directly reinforces dysfunctional behavior (Wilson, 1991). The objective of this paper is to test this hypothesis by specifying the community characteristics of geographical areas that show different concentrations of delinquency and teenage motherhood.

The tradition of ecological studies of delinquency is well established, and to a large extent these studies support the notion that underclass characteristics are associated with a high incidence of delinquency (for a review of that literature see Figueira-McDonough, 1991). For example, Beasley and Antunes (1974), Sichor, Decker and O'Brien (1979), Taylor and Covington (1988), and Curry and Spergel (1988) have found that poverty in a community is a strong predictor of delinquency. Skogan (1990), reviewing several studies, reported a consistent relation between the physical deterioration of a community and delinquency. Research done by McGahey (1986) and Sullivan (1989) documents a strong relationship between adult unemployment and delinquency. In the work of Simcha-Fagan and Schwarz (1986) and of Schuerman and Kobrin (1986), the high proportion of female-headed households was found to be related to delinquency.

High male sex ratio was also hypothesized by Messner and Sampson (1991) as a predictor of delinquency. This and the findings that transiency is associated with crime (Shaw and McKay, 1942; Stark, 1987; Sampson, 1988) contradicts Wilson's (1987) characterization of the underclass as being stable with a low male sex ratio. All the other findings fit the pattern of underclass communities.

Studies of neighborhood effects on teenage pregnancy are practically nonexistent. Hogan and Kitawa (1985), by differentiating neighborhoods in terms of poverty level, sex ratio and male delinquency, found that teenagers in low status

neighborhoods had a one-third higher probability of getting pregnant than in middle or high status neighborhoods. Figueira-McDonough (1992) found that census tracts with high percentages of teenagers delivering children in a given year had more unwed mothers, more minorities and dropouts, and marginal access to medical care when compared with census tracts with low rates of teenage motherhood. Crane's research (1991) shows that neighborhoods in large cities with very low representation of high status workers (< 10%) had extremely high rates of teenage motherhood as compared to all other communities.

Studies of teenage motherhood using individual levels of analysis are more frequent. They lend credibility to the hypothesis that in communities with underclass characteristics the rates of teenage motherhood will be high. Teenage motherhood has been found to be associated with school problems and dropping out, as well as with low parental supervision (Upchurch and McCarthy, 1990; Card and Wise, 1978; Phipps-Jones, 1980; Hayes, 1987; Chilman, 1983), with poverty (Jencks and Mayer, 1990), with families headed by women and low parental education (Michael and Tuma, 1985; Abrahams& Morrison and Waite, 1988; McLanahan and Bumpass, 1988). Ethnological studies (e.g., Anderson, 1990) describe the effect of "entrapment" (residential stability in poor communities) on the reproduction of precocious motherhood.

A few studies go further in proposing a relationship between delinquency and teen motherhood. Douvan and Adelson (1966) and Jessor and Jessor (1975, 1977) have presumed a strong association

between the two behaviors. They argue that since sexual intercourse for young girls constitutes a break in the prevailing norm, girls who engage in it become more susceptible to violating other norms including associating with delinquents. Others have proposed that engaging in sex might represent a compensation for frustrated legitimate aspirations or a form of rebellion against double standards (Datesman, et. al., 1975; Sandhu and Allen, 1969). There are two problems with these interpretations: they assume a direct relationship between sexual activity and teenage motherhood, and they disregard the decreasing stigmatization of premarital sex that has occurred over the last three decades (O'Connell and Rogers, 1984; Zelnick, Kanter and Ford, 1981).

A revised view has been proposed by Neckerman and Wilson (1987). They have advanced the explanation that the extremely high rates of unmarried motherhood in Chicago's black underclass communities are due to a limited marriage pool for young women resulting from a low male/female sex ratio (see also Gutentag and Secord, 1983; Heer and Grossbard-Sechtman, 1985). They suggest that this relative scarcity of marriageable men also relects an absence of provider capabilities among young men (Anderson, 1991).

So the high rate of death, imprisonment, involvement in illegal activities, and unemployment among this population strongly decrease the access of young women to marriage partners. Delinquency rates and adult criminal rates account for three of the factors reducing the marriage pool. Verification of the relationship between unwed motherhood and unemployment has been the

focus of several recent studies (Grant Foundation, 1988; Johnson and Sum, 1987). From this research we can conclude that unemployment is a predictor of both teenage motherhood as well as delinquency (McGahey, 1986; Sullivan, 1987).

A review of the literature suggests, then, that selected lower class characteristics predict both delinquency and teenage motherhood. High levels of poverty, weak work and school participation, family vulnerability and high levels of segregation are hypothesized to be directly related to high rates of delinquency and teenage motherhood.[1]

For two of the predictors originally identified--sex ratio and mobility--the literature contains somewhat contradictory expectations. Messner and Sampson (1991) propose that high sex ratio is a predictor of delinquency, while Neckerman and Wilson (1987) propose that low sex ratio is a predictor of teenage pregnancy. The traditional ecological studies of delinquency found that high mobility in a community increased delinquency. Anderson's (1991) research portrays high rates of teenage pregnancy in communities with characteristics of stability, which fits with Wilson's concept of poverty concentration and isolation characterizing the contemporary urban underclass.

The study presented here, using geographic area (zip code areas) as units of analysis, will try to determine to what extent the commonly identified predictors define communities with high rates of delinquency and teenage motherhood and, on the other hand,

to what extent mobility and sex ratio differentiate between the two rates.

DATA AND OPERATIONALIZATION OF INDICATORS

The research setting is a major urban center in the Southwest, Maricopa County in Arizona where Phoenix is located, with high rates of poverty and segregation. The selection of the site was guided to a large extent by the need to know more about poor Hispanic communities. Most ecological studies and research done on the underclass have focused on African-American communities (e.g., Peterson and Jencks, 1991) in spite of the growing awareness that a high percentage of Hispanics live below the poverty level and in residentially segregated neighborhoods (Santiago and Wilder, 1991; Aponte, 1991; Bean and Tienda, 1990). In 1980, forty percent of the Hispanic population of Phoenix lived in poor areas (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1985). For the same year, measures of segregation show an index of residential dissimilarity between Anglos and Hispanic of .494 and an index of probability of contact of .591 (Massey and Denton, 1987).

The data used to characterize the communities were acquired from the 1980 Census Extract Data Set prepared by the Panel Study of Income Dynamics at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. These materials include information on age, ethnicity, education, sex ratio, family structure, work participation, income and mobility.

Information on the 1980 birth of children to teenage mothers was obtained by census tract, from the 1980 vital statistics of the Arizona Health Department. Delinquency data for 1980 were gathered from the Juvenile Court. Reliable residential information for juveniles handled by the court was only available by zip code. Therefore, for the purpose of this research, census tract information was recorded to match the zip code areas. The zip code area constitutes the unit of analysis.

Although there is more agreement about the validity of operationalizing communities as census tracts, Brooks-Gunn and Associates (1991) found that structural predictors of teenage behavior yielded similar results when based on census tracts and zip codes. The 68 zip code areas of Maricopa County constitute the universe of analysis. Table 1 shows the independent variables used in this study.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

To assess if community characteristics predict rates of delinquency as well as of teenage motherhood, a typology of areas with different rates of delinquency and teenage pregnancy was constructed. First, rates were calculated from the incidence of each behavior relative to the teenage population of the area. Then each rate was divided (using the median as the criterion) into two groups indicating "high" and "low." The zip code areas were then classified in four categories resulting from the cross tabulation of the two dichotomous rates. We ended up with 23 areas having low

delinquency and teenage motherhood rates, 23 rating high on both counts and 23 having a mixed composition. Of the latter, 10 had high delinquency rates and low teenage motherhood rates and 13 the reverse combination.

This classification generated the strata used in the contrast analysis shown in Table 2. No difference was found between these groups regarding age, housing, number of children per household, receipt of public assistance, and noneconomic participation of males. Examination of the interpair difference for other variables uncovered several significant patterns.

1. For the most part, there are no differences between group 1 (low delinquency and low teenage motherhood) and group 2 (high delinquency and low teenage motherhood) with regard to education, male employment, part-time employment, income, poverty and dropout.
2. These two groups had a significantly higher status profile (a more educated population, with higher employment rates, less part-time jobs, greater family and household income, less poverty and lower dropout rate) than group 3 (low delinquency and high teenage pregnancy) and group 4 (high delinquency and high teenage pregnancy).

3. The difference between the better-off communities (group 1 and 2) is greater in relation to group 4 (HH) than with respect to group 3 (LH) in terms of education, income, poverty and dropout rates.
4. Furthermore, groups 1, 2 and 3 are indistinguishable in terms of ethnicity, sex ratio, single heads of households or extreme poverty (percent below $5,000 income). They are significantly different from group 4 (HH) which has a greater proportion of Latinos, female-headed households, extreme poverty and higher male/female sex ratio.
5. In relation to two variables, group 2 (high delinquency/low teenage motherhood) stands significantly apart from all the other groups. It shows less residential stability and lower female noneconomic participation than all the others.

These results lead to the following conclusions:

1. Communities in group 1 and 2 can be characterized as better-off than the ones included in groups 3 and 4. Their education, employment, and income levels are significantly higher and their part-time employment, poverty, and dropout rates are lower. It appears, therefore, that those characteristics

are important in predicting the rate of teenage motherhood, since the better-off areas have lower rates than the worse-off areas.

2. It is interesting, however, that in terms of education, income, poverty and dropout, the distance between the better-off communities is greater in relation to group 4 (high delinquency, high teenage motherhood) than to group 3 (low delinquency, high teenage motherhood). If we add to this that group 4 is significantly different from all the others in minority composition, female-headed households and extreme poverty, we can conclude that the profile of group 4 matches the underclass pattern. The results seem to confirm that such contexts produce high rates of both delinquency and teenage motherhood.

3. Groups with high delinquency have both features of better-off and worse-off communities, and the contrast analysis suggests that the factors predicting high delinquency at both levels are distinct. For worse-off areas, deterioration of conditions with higher incidence of extreme poverty, female-headed households and concentrations of minorities seems to be conducive to high rates of delinquency. For better-off communities, a greater proportion of economically

active women and more mobility favor the emergence of high delinquency rates.

4. It should be noted that, with respect to sex ratio and mobility, our findings are specific. That is, the Messner and Sampson hypotheses receives some confirmation for delinquency in worse-off neighborhoods, and the traditional mobility hypotheses is supported in terms of high delinquency in better-off neighborhoods. No effect of either of these variables on rates of teenage motherhood was found.

Before moving to a multivariate analysis of the delinquency/ teenage motherhood groups, the correlations among the predictors were examined to check for multicollinearity. As shown in Table 4, correlations among work participation indicators are extremely high. Given the theoretical importance attributed to male employment as being more related to income stability and overall perception of opportunity (McGahey, 1986; Sullivan, 1989), this variable was selected as the single indicator of work participation. The examination of this cluster of correlations is informative, showing that male and female employment and household income are positively intercorrelated. Those variables are negatively correlated with part-time employment and noneconomic participation.

The percentage of Hispanics in a given area is strongly and directly correlated with levels of poverty and with low education. For comparative purposes (with other studies) the minority indicator was selected as representative of this cluster, but it should be clear that it is a proxy measure of poverty.

The final selection of predictors for the multivariate analysis indicated in Table 1 was also based on the results from the bivariate analysis. Variables that showed no interstrata differences were dropped. Since the intent of this paper is to distinguish between areas classified according to varying combinations of levels of delinquency and teenage motherhood rates, the use of discriminant function analysis is especially appropriate. This type of analysis can handle categorical dependent variables and is adaptable to small Ns.

The results of the discriminate analysis are given in Table 4. The analysis yields three functions, although by the statistical criterion of the Wilks-Lambda statistic, the third function is not statistically significant. The analysis classified correctly 68% of the cases and reduced error proportional to chance by 55% (TAU).

The first function was clearly the most important (accounting for 79.4% of the variance) and especially strong in differentiating groups one and four (centroids). Areas with low rates of delinquency and teenage motherhood are clearly different from areas high in both rates. Group 2 (high delinquency, low teenage motherhood) is nearly equally defined by function 1 and 2, while

group 3 is weakly characterized by the first function and only slightly better by function 3.

Since function 1 is characterized in decreasing order, by dropout rate, family income, male employment and percent of Latinos, we know that communities in groups 1 and 2 have more income and employment and lower dropout rates and fewer Latinos than groups 3 and 4. We also know that differences along these variables are stronger when compared with group 4. Group 2 (high delinquency, low teenage motherhood) is equally defined by function 2. Areas included in this group have considerably less residential stability than areas in all the other groups. Finally, group 3 is marginally characterized by function 1 and slightly more by function 3, which is dominated by a lower proportion of female heads of households.

These findings are very similar to those resulting from the contrast analysis.

1. The presence of higher income and employment rates and of low dropout rates and low minority representation predicts groups with low teenage pregnancy. High delinquency among these groups is a function of mobility.
2. Low income, high unemployment, high dropout and large representation of minorities in a given area favors a context where high delinquency and high teenage motherhood rates emerge.

3. Areas with high teen motherhood rates and low delinquency (group 3) seem to be not as deprived (in terms of income and unemployment) and to have a lower concentration of minorities and lower dropout rates, than communities included in group 4 (high delinquency, high teenage motherhood). Another distinguishing factor that might be important in preventing delinquency is that communities included in this group tend to have a lower percentage of female-headed households.

4. The importance of dropout rates in defining the first function (as verified by the standardized canonical coefficient) sheds some light on the relationship between dropout, delinquency and teenage motherhood rates. Although most of the writings on the subject presuppose a strong relationship between all three types of behavior (e.g., Elliott and Voss, 1974; Upchurch and McCarthy, 1990; Hogan and Kitawa, 1985), a closer look at the impact of function 1 leads to a different conclusion. Dropout rate is directly associated with the incidence of teenage motherhood (groups 3 and 4), but it is not as clearly associated with delinquency rates (group 2). The correlations of dropout rates with delinquency (.43) and teenage motherhood (.72) confirm the

difference in level of association between the three variables. Another study using the same data confirms the nonlineariity of the association between delinquency and dropout rates (Figueira-McDonough, 1993).

CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the effects of community variables on rates of delinquency as well as on teenage motherhood in an urban center with a large proportion of Latinos. A review of the ecological studies of delinquency and of teenage pregnancy suggested that the characteristics attributed to the underclass (low employment, low income, concentrated poverty, high dropout rates, high proportion of female-headed families and over-representation of minorities) would predict high rates of both delinquency and teenage motherhood. These studies were less clear about the effects of mobility and sex ratio. Since the phenomenon of the reproduction of the underclass has been attributed to the pervasiveness of these behaviors among the young in such communities, it was important to test this hypothesis.

The unit of analysis was the zip code area. The dependent variable was constructed as a simple typology combining levels of delinquency and teenage motherhood. Contrast analysis and Discriminant function analysis were used to compare the strata of the typology. The bivariate and multivariate results were quite consistent. These findings indicate that area contexts defined in

terms of underclass characteristics in fact register simultaneously high rates of delinquency and teenage motherhood. Conversely, communities with low rates of delinquency and teenage motherhood rates have the opposite characteristics.

The mixed groups (combining one high rate with a low rate) prove to be the most intriguing. Communities with average incomes below $23,000, with employment rates below 50%, minority populations above 15%, and dropout rates above 20% are more likely to have higher rates of teenage motherhood. Delinquency tends to be higher when these economic conditions deteriorate (average income below $19,000, minority concentration over 25% and dropout rates of 30%). We can conclude that low income, work and school participation and evidence of residential segregation first affects teenage motherhood rates. Worsening of these conditions in residential areas creates an environment that facilitates high delinquency rates as well. But high rates of delinquency can occur in communities with positive characteristics in terms of income and employment, predominately anglo and with low dropout rates. Circumstances of high mobility (on the average nearly one-third higher than in other groups) predict high delinquency in such areas. The impact of family composition and sex ratio turns out to be rather marginal by comparison. Both dimensions seem to reinforce delinquency in deprived areas.

What might be some of the more generally theoretical implications of these findings? The theory of "low opportunity costs," which interpret deviant behavior among youth as a function

of low future expectations, seems to fit closest with the findings of this study. "Low opportunity costs" may be more crucial to teenage motherhood and still more so for high delinquency in worse-off communities, while the anomie that accompanies high mobility might be more directly tied to high rates of delinquency in better-off communities. Subcultural theories, usually based on family structure and supervisory functions and modeling, do not receive support, given the marginal effect of female-headed households and the lack of impact of number of children per household, crowdedness or percentage of the population receiving public assistance income.

In light of these results, it would seem that interventions increasing the community level of work participation and school participation might be the most important strategy in decreasing both teenage pregnancy and delinquency in deprived neighborhoods. Since the proportion of Latinos in a given area is strongly related to poverty, both of these interventions should target minorities specifically. Addressing high delinquency in better-off communities would require programs designed to integrate newcomers into the area and devising formal structures to encourage organizational stability in spite of population mobility (Whyte, 1956; Christenson, 1967; Warren, 1967).

NOTE

1. An interpretive comment is indicated with regard to family vulnerability and percentage of minority concentration. Recent research on single-headed families and youth deviant behavior have concluded that this association is not a direct result of the structure of the family but of the resource vulnerability of many of those families best accounted for by the feminization of poverty (Matsueda and Heimer, 1982; Farnsworth, 1984; Figueira-McDonough, 1992). The large representation of minority populations in a community has often been used as a predictor of disorganization (e.g., Curry and Spergel, 1988; Schuerman and Kobrin, 1986; Crane, 1991). Often the use of ethnicity or race serves as a proxy of poverty. Given that, especially in cities, nonwhites live disproportionately in poor communities, such operationalization seems valid. However, there is little evidence that minorities constitute a subculture with norms clashing with the general culture (e.g., Corcoran, et. al., 1985; Figueira-McDonough, 1991). From Wilson's (1987) perspective, the overrepresentation of minorities in the inner city is an indication of past segregation and of long-term poverty.

REFERENCES

Abrahamse, F., Morrison, A., and Waite, L. (1988). Beyond Stereotypes: Who Becomes a Single Mother?. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Anderson, F. (1991). "Neighborhood Effects on Teenage Pregnancy." In The Urban Underclass, edited by C. Jencks and P. Peterson. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Aponte, R. (1991). "Urban Hispanic Poverty: Disagregations and Explanations. Social Problems, 38, 516-528.

Bean, F. and Tienda, M. (1990). The Hispanic Population of the United States. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Beasley, R. and Antunes, G. (1974). "The Etiology of Urban Crime: An Ecological Analysis." Criminology, 11, 4, 439-461.

Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G., Kato, P., and Sealand, N. (1991). "Do Neighborhoods Influence Child and Adolescent Behavior." Mimeo. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

BUTTLER, A. (1992) "THE CHANGING ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF TEENAGE CHILD BEARING" SOCIAL SERVICE REVIEW. 66,1: 1-31.

Card, J. and Wise, L. (1978). "Teenage Mothers and Teenage Fathers: The Impact of Early Childbearing on Parents' Personal and Professional Lives." Family Planning Perspectives, 10 (July/August), 199-205.

Chilman, C. (1983). "Adolescent Sexuality." In A Changing Society. New York: Wiley.

Corcoran, M., Duncan, G. and Gurin, P. (1985). "Myth and Reality: The Causes and Persistence of Poverty." Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 4, 516-536.

Crane, J. (1991). "Effects of Neighborhoods on Dropping Out of School and Teenage Childbearing." In The Urban Underclass, edited by C. Jencks and P. Peterson. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Curry, G. and Spergel, T. (1988). "Gang Homicide, Delinquency, and Community." Criminology, 26, 381-406.

Datesman, S.K., Scarpitti, F.R. and Stephenson, R.H. (1975). "Female Delinquency: An Application of Self and Opportunity Theories." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, (July), 107-123.

Douvan, E. and Adelson, J. (1966). The Adolescent Experience. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Elliott, D. and Voss, H. L. (1974). Delinquency and Dropout. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Ellwood, D. T. (1988). Poor Support: Poverty in the American Family. New York: Basic Books.

Farnsworth, M. (1984). "Family Structure, Family Attributes, and Delinquency in a Sample of Low-Income, Minority Males and Females." Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13, 4, 349-364.

Figueira-McDonough, J. (1993). "Residence, Dropping Out and Delinquency Rates." Deviant Behavior (forthcoming).

Figueira-McDonough, J. (1992). "Underclass Context and Teenage Motherhood." Paper presented at the Meetings of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Figueira-McDonough, J. (1992). "Community Structure and Female Delinquency Rates: A Heuristic Discussion." Youth and Society, 24, 1:3-30.

FIGUEIRA-MCDONOUGH, J. (1991). "COMMUNITY STRUCTURE AND DELINQUENCY: A TYPOLOGY" SOCIAL SERVICE REVIEW. 65: 68-91

Gephart, M.A. and Pearson, R. (1988). "Contemporary Research on the Urban Underclass." Items, 42, 1/2:1-10.

Grant Foundation Report. (1988). The Declining Economic Fortunes of Young Americans.

Guttentag, M. and Secord, P. (1983). Too Many Women: The Sex Ratio Question. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hayes, C. (Ed.) (1987). Risking the Future: Adolescent Sexuality, Pregnancy and Childbearing. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Heer, D. and Grossbard-Shechtman (1981). "The Impact of the Female Marriage Squeeze and the Contraceptive Revolution on Sex Roles and the Women's Liberation Movement in the United States, 1960 to 1975." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 49-65.

Hogan, P. and Kitagawa, E. (1985). "The Impact of Social Status, Family Structure and Neighborhood on the Fertility of Black Adolescents." American Journal of Sociology, 90, 925-955.

Jencks, C. (1991). "Is the American Underclass Growing?" In The Urban Underclass, edited by C. Jencks and P. Peterson. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Jencks, C. and Mayer, S. (1990). "The Social Consequences of Growing up in a Poor Neighborhood." In Inner City Poverty in the United States, edited by Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. and Michael G.H. McGeary. Washington: National Academy Press.

Jencks, C. and Peterson P. (Eds.) (1991). The Urban Underclass. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Jessor, S.L. and Jessor, R. (1977). Problem Behavior and Psychological Development. New York: Academic Press.

Jessor, S.L. and Jessor, R. (1975). "Transition From Virginity to Nonvirginity Among Youth: A Social-Psychological Study Over Time." Developmental Psychology, 11, 473-484.

Johnson, C. and Sum, A. (1987). Declining Earnings of Young Men: Their Relation to Poverty, Teen Pregnancy and Family Formation. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund.

Massey, D. and Denton, N. (1987). "Trends in Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians: 1970-1980." American Sociological Review, 52, 824-840.

Matsueda, D. and Heimer, K. (1987). "Race, Family Structure and Delinquency." American Sociological Review, 52, 824-40.

McGahey, R. M. (1986). "Economic Conditions, Neighborhood Organization and Urban Crime." In Communities and Crime, edited by A. J. Reiss and M. Tonry. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. Pp. 231-270.

McLanahan, S. and Bumpass, L (1988). "Intergenerational Consequences of Family Disruption." American Journal of Sociology, 94 (July), 130-152.

Messner, S. F. and Sampson, R. J. (1991). "Sex Ratio, Family Disruption and Rates of Violent Crime: The Paradox of Demographic Structure." Social Forces, 69, 693-713.

Michael, T. and Tuma, N. (1985). "Entry Into Marriage by Young Men and Women: The Influence of Family Background." Demography, 22, 515-544.

O'Connel, M. and Rogers, C. (1984). "Out of Wedlock Birth, Premarital Pregnancies and Their Effect on Family Formation and Dissolution." Family Planning Perspectives, 16, 4, 157-161.

Pearson, R. (1989). "Economy, Culture, Public Policy and the Urban Underclass." Items, 43, 2, 23-26.

Phipps-Yonas, S. (1980). "Teenage Pregnancy and Motherhood: A Review of the Literature." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 50 (July), 403-431.

Sandhu, H.S. and Allen, D.E. (1969). "Family Delinquency: Goal Aspirations and Anomie." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology (May), 107-110.

Santiago, A.M. and Wilder, M. (1991). "Residential Segregation and Links to Minority Poverty: The Case of Latinos in the United States." Social Problems, 38, 492-515.

Schuerman, L. and Kobrin, S. (1986). "Community Careers in Crime." In Communities and Crime, edited by A. Reiss and M. Tonry. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Pp. 67-100.

Shaw, C.R. and McKay, C. (1942). Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shichor, D., Decker, D. and O'Brien, R. (1979). "Population Density and Criminal Victimization." Criminology, 17, 184-193.

Simcha-Fagan, O. and Schwartz, J. (1986). "Neighborhood and Delinquency: An Assessment of Contextual Effects." Criminology, 24, 667-704.

Skogan, W.G. (1990). Disorder and Decay: Crime and the Spiral Decay in American Neighborhoods. New York: The Free Press.

Stark, R. (1987). "Deviant Places: A Theory of the Ecology of Crime." Criminology, 25, 893-910.

Sullivan, M.L. (1989). Getting Paid: Youth Crime and Work in the Inner City. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Taylor, R. and Covington, J. (1988). "Neighborhood Changes in Ecology and Violence." Criminology, 25, 553-590.

Upchurch, D. and McCarthy, J. (1990). "The Timing of First Birth and High School Completion." American Sociological Review, 55, 224-234.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1985). Poverty Areas in Large Cities. 1980 Census of the Population, Subject Reports, Volume 2. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wilson, W. J. (1991). "Public Policy Research and the Truly Disadvantaged." In The Urban Underclass, edited by C. Jencks and P. Peterson. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

WILSON, W. J. AND NECKERMAN, K. (1987) "POVERTY AND FAMILY STRUCTURE: THE WIDING GAP BETWEEN EVIDENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES". IN FIGHTING POVERTY, S. DANZIGER AND D. WEINBERG (EDS.) 24 CAMBRIDGE, HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Zelnick, M., Kanter, J. and Ford, K. (1981). Sex and Pregnancy in Adolescents. Beverly Hills: Sage.

TABLE 1

List of Area Variables

Population Characteristics

* Proportion Latinos
  Proportion Young (16-34)
* Sex Ratio (M/F)
  Low Education (No High School)

Family Organization

* Proportion Families with Children Headed by a Woman
  Average Number of Children per Household
  Proportion Receiving Public Assistance Income

School Participation

* Dropout Rate

Work Participation

* Employment Rate
  Male Employment Rate
  Female Employment Rate
  Part-time Employment - Male
  Part-time Employment - Female
  Noneconomic Participation (unemployed & out of labor force) M
  Noneconomic Participation (unemployed & out of labor force) F

Income

* Average Income
  Average Household Income
  Proportion of Families Below Poverty Level
  Proportion of Families With Income < $10,000
  Proportion of Families With Income < $5,000

Residential Stability

* Stability Last 5 Years (lived in same house for last 5 years)

* Variables selected for multivariate analysis on the basis of the results of contrast analysis and non-multicuiinearity.

TABLE 2

Comparison of Population Zip Areas Characteristics
By Strata Representing Different Incidences of
Delinquency and Teen Motherhood

	Young		Latinos	
	M	St.D.	M	St.D.
Group 1 - Lo Del, Lo Teen Moth. N = 23	.27	.05	.05	.05
Group 2 - Hi Del, Lo Teen Moth. N = 10	.33	.06	.06	.03
Group 3 - Lo Del, Hi Teen Moth. N = 13	.27	.09	.14	.12
Group 4 - Hi Del, Hi Teen Moth. N = 23	.30	.10	.27	.22
F	1.61		9.82	
Sig	----		.000	
T-Interpair Sig	----		1,2,3-4	

	Sex Ratio		Education		Sing. Moth.		# Children	
	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.
Group 1	-.02	.12	.21	.07	.07	.04	.91	.19
Group 2	-.09	.17	.14	.06	.07	.03	1.0	.22
Group 3	-.06	.16	.30	.12	.07	.04	1.0	.38
Group 4	.07	.22	.40	.17	.12	.06	1.1	.40
F	2.74		13.69		3.7		1.93	
Sig	.05		.000		.01		----	
T	1,2,3-4		1,2-3-4		1,2,3-4		----	

	Pub. Asst.		Stability		Mult. Res.		Vacant Hous	
	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.
Group 1	4.8	4.3	.42	.12	.16	.11	.09	.05
Group 2	2.0	1.5	.29	.10	.18	.17	.10	.05
Group 3	3.3	3.1	.41	.12	.08	.10	.08	.02
Group 4	5.4	4.4	.40	.11	.15	.16	.09	.06
F	2.16		3.28		1.42		.610	
Sig	.10		.02		----		----	
T	----		1,2-3,4		----		----	

	Employment		Emp. - Fem.		Emp. - Male		PT Emp.	
	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.
Group 1	.57	.09	.48	.09	.65	.10	.42	.08
Group 2	.63	.04	.56	.04	.71	.05	.35	.04
Group 3	.50	.15	.40	.12	.58	.15	.48	.14
Group 4	.49	.10	.43	.10	.55	.11	.48	.12
F	5.83		6.27		5.96		3.98	
Sig	.001		.001		.001		.01	
T	1,2-3,4		1-2-3,4		1,2-3,4		1,2-3,4	

	PT Emp - F		PT Emp - M		Noecon Part		Noecon - F	
	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.
Group 1	.58	.08	.27	.09	.39	.09	.53	.09
Group 2	.50	.04	.21	.05	.31	.04	.44	.04
Group 3	.65	.12	.32	.17	.45	.15	.60	.12
Group 4	.63	.10	.33	.14	.44	.13	.57	.11
F	6.14		2.77		3.73		5.55	
Sig	.001		.05		.02		.002	
T	1,2-3,4		2,1-3,4		2-1,3,4		2-1,3,4	

	Noecon - M		Fam. Income		HH Income		Below Pov.	
	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.
Group 1	.21	.09	28,485	5,884	19,360	4,893	.06	.02
Group 2	.16	.05	26,877	4,517	20,126	4,763	.07	.03
Group 3	.26	.18	22,692	5,158	15,340	5,165	.11	.06
Group 4	.27	.15	18,860	3,667	13,004	4,171	.17	.11
F	2.06		16.31		9.33		10.34	
Sig	-----		.000		.000		.000	
T	-----		1,2-3-4		1,2-3-4		1,2-3-4	

	<10,000 Inc		< 5,000 Inc		Dropout Rate	
	M	St.D.	M	St.D.	M	St.D.
Group 1	.13	.04	.04	.01	.12	.04
Group 2	.11	.05	.03	.01	.10	.04
Group 3	.18	.06	.06	.03	.21	.10
Group 4	.26	.12	.10	.06	.29	.10
F	14.41		9.45		20.9	
Sig	.000		.000		.000	
T	1,2-3-4		1,2,3-4		1,2-3-4	

TABLE 3

Correlations Between Area Characteristics

	Youth	Sex Ratio	Lo Educ	Fem H/Hld	Child/HH	Pub Asst	Stability	Avlt Hous	Vac Hous	Emp Rate	Emp Rate/F	Emp Rate/M	PT Emp/F	PT Emp/M	Nonecon	Nonecon/F	Nonecon/M	Fam Inc	Hh Inc	Below Pov	< $10,000	< $5,000	Dropouts
Latinos	.10	.12	.85	.59	-.07	.15	.42	.06	-.15	-.13	-.14	-.14	-.20	.05	.05	.12	-.02	-.59	-.35	.75	.83	.86	.69
Youth		.16	-.12	.46	.53	.22	-.16	.42	-.41	.70	.81	.59	-.82	-.73	-.80	-.83	-.76	-.02	.39	-.07	.65	.11	.03
Sex Ratio			.45	.52	-.03	.23	.26	.45	-.05	-.22	-.12	-.28	.13	.19	.14	.10	.14	-.33	-.33	.59	.56	.57	.23
Lo Educ				.55	-.12	.25	.58	.03	-.07	-.36	-.37	-.36	.42	.32	.33	.37	.24	-.75	-.60	.88	.85	.85	.90
Fem H/Hld					.55	.55	.37	.50	-.24	.22	.30	.15	.28	-.15	-.21	-.29	-.22	-.39	-.12	.54	.68	.66	.53
Child/HH						.65	.10	.16	-.37	.49	.51	.47	-.49	-.43	-.45	-.50	-.44	.23	.42	-.24	-.12	-.13	.37
Pub Asst							.42	.41	-.23	.18	.21	.16	-.2	-.07	-.10	-.18	-.12		-.06	.20	.29	.26	.85
Stability								.18	.32	-.13	-.15	-.12	.22	.22	.20	.17	.15	.313	-.30	.48	.44	.46	.12
Avlt Hous									-.06	.23	.31	.17	-.28	-.07	-.14	-.26	-.10	-.07	-.11	.22	.25	.23	.24
Vac Hous										-.32	-.38	-.26	.31	.44	.43	.38	.46	.03	-.28	.04	.00	-.05	.33
Emp Rate											.95	.98	-.92	-.88	-.93	-.99	-.87	.33	.73	-.42	-.25	-.20	-.19
Emp Rate/F												.87	-.98	-.88	-.90	-.93	-.88	.46	.79	-.47	-.27	-.20	-.17
Emp Rate/M													-.83	-.84	-.84	-.84	-.84	.52	.80	-.49	-.28	-.21	.18
PT Emp														.96	.91	.98	.84	-.36	-.70	.46	.29	.24	.27
PT Emp/F															.98	.89	.99	-.39	-.80	.43	.28	.20	.16
PT Emp/M																.95	.98	-.35	-.78	.40	.24	.17	.18
Nonecon																	.89	-.34	-.74	.42	.25	.19	.20
Nonecon/F																		-.32	-.76	.34	.19	.12	.10
Nonecon/M																			.81	-.79	-.66	-.64	-.66
Fam Inc																				-.70	-.52	-.47	-.47
Hh Inc																					.91	.88	.72
Below Pov																						.97	.72
< $10,000																							.73
< $5,000																							

31

TABLE 4

Discriminant Function Analysis of
Delinquent Teenage Motherhood Rates

	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3
Group Centroids			
1. Lo Del, Lo Teen Moth.	1.17	.44	.15
2. Hi Del, Lo Teen Moth.	1.14	-1.20	.06
3. Lo Del, Hi Teen Moth.	- .34	.28	-.52
4. Hi Del, Hi Teen Moth.	-1.48	.08	.17
Canonical Correlation	.77	.48	.26
Eigenvalue	1.48	.31	.07
Rel. % Variance Explained by the Function	79.4	16.7	3.9
Wilks Lambda	.28	.71	.93
Significance	.0000	.04	----
ETA^2=% Variance Explained by the Groups	59.3	23.0	6.8

WITHIN GROUP STRUCTURE

	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3	Std Canonical Coefficient
Coefficients (Bivariate)				
Dropout	-.80	.14	.14	.78
Family Income	.71	.17	.11	.36
Latinos	-.55	.07	.34	.15
Empl. Males	.40	.31	.09	.30
Stability	.12	.64	.14	.92
Sex Ratio	.22	.14	.82	.53
Single Mother	.30	.10	.73	.71

Correct Group Prediction

1. 78.3
2. 70.0
3. 61.5
4. 60.9

T = 68.1
T_{AV} = 55.5